



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(21) But for Dr. Sandys's suggestion (c. 57, §4) of *δικάζουσι*[*ν ἐν ἡλι*]*αι*[*α*] *καὶ ὑπαίθριοι* nothing except words of praise can be said. This restoration reconciles the language of Isocrates c. Callim. 52, 54, etc., with that of the tradition. The word *ἡλιαία* has here a double connotation, 'in the sunlight,' and, less directly, that of a heliastic court in general.

(22) It is hardly accurate to say that "many Panathenaic amphorae are found in . . . Greece" (on c. 59, §1). Is it not a fact that fewer are found there than elsewhere in the Hellenic world?

(23) From c. 60, §3, the inference may be drawn that the archon did not become a member of the Areopagus until after the expiration of his term of office. Perhaps this fact throws some light on the theory of Lange—now, however, for other reasons, hardly tenable—whereby the fifty-one ephetae and nine archons together made up the ancient court.

(24) The following misprints, or other minor faults, have caught my eye: P. xxxii, for 'nine' archons read 'ten.' P. 61, 17 read *ἐφώνησεν* in adn. cr. P. 65, 39, and elsewhere, *πρῶτος* is irregularly spelled. P. 79, 11, why not *συνέπιπτεν* without the []? P. 86, 19, adn. cr., read 39 (not 35). P. 150, 4 (col. 21, 7), the spelling *ΕΝΤΡΑΦΟΝΤΑΙ* is certainly worth citing alongside of the *ἐν Πειραιεῖ* of Demosthenes (Σ). P. lx, and often, 'Alcmeonidae' is the better spelling: the editor always corrects the traditional Munychion to Munichion. Mytilene is inconsistently spelled.

But all these criticisms and corrections, and others that might be suggested, are of very slight consequence when one considers the vast body of unimpeachably sound doctrine in the book. In his effort, to use the happy line of George Herbert quoted by him,

"to copie fair what Time hath blurr'd"

—after all one of the chief duties of the classical scholar—Dr. Sandys has been signally successful. It will be many years before his book can be superseded, and then only because advancing knowledge gives us new points of vision and appreciation, and throws all our old lore into a new perspective.

J. H. WRIGHT.

Der Vokalismus der oskischen Sprache, von CARL DARLING BUCK. Leipzig, K. F. Koehler's Antiquarium, 1892. xv + 219 pp.

Within the past two years the interest in the dialects of the Italic peninsula has been greatly stimulated by the appearance of several important works. Pauli, in the third volume of the *Alt-italische Forschungen*, has gathered together the inscriptions of the Veneti. More recently Krall, by the publication of the long inscription found in the wrappings of a mummy belonging to the Agram Museum, has furnished new material for the solution of the Etruscan problem. A Swiss scholar, Robert von Planta, has undertaken a grammar of the Oscan-Umbrian dialects, of which the first volume, treating the Lautlehre, in 600 pages, has appeared, while the second, which is to include also the entire body of inscriptions, is promised within a year. The same scholar, in *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, II, pp. 435-41, has recently published 'Eine dritte oskische Bleitafel,' which is only a fragment. More

special treatises, both by pupils of Brugmann and both written in competition for a prize offered by the University of Leipzig in October, 1890, are 'Die oskischen *i* und *e* Vocale,' by Gotthelf Bronisch (Leipzig, 1892), and the work whose title is given above. The work of Buck failed to receive the prize for purely formal reasons, although considered by the Faculty as on the whole the better of the two.

One has only to compare these works with Bruppacher's *Versuch einer Lautlehre der oskischen Sprache* (Zurich, 1869), to see the justification of the prize, and the progress made in scientific treatment. It is not our purpose here to compare the two in detail, or to point out their different conclusions where the same questions are involved. The work of Buck is the more comprehensive, as it treats all the vowels and diphthongs, and contains more that is of interest to the student of Latin. A firm grasp of phonetic principles is shown, and a wide acquaintance with the recent literature, while the author maintains with spirit his independent views, and does not hesitate to take issue with older scholars. In the preface the importance of the comparative method is insisted upon, and a sharp rap administered to Blass in passing. The orthography of the Oscan inscriptions is shown to be more precise than that of the Umbrian, and more to be relied upon for determining differences of sound-quality, although vacillating in respect to quantity. In the introduction general questions are treated, as to the extent of the Oscan linguistic territory, the age of the monuments, the varieties of writing, the absence of a sign for *o* in the original Oscan-Umbrian alphabet, the primitive character of the Oscan vocalism, especially in the conservation of diphthongs. Finally a list of words borrowed from the Greek and Latin is given, in which we miss *turris* (*tiurri*); cf. Saalfeld's *Tensaurus*.

The treatment then proceeds in seven chapters, the first being devoted to the Indogermanic *a*-vowels, including *ɶ*, the second to the *e* and *i*-sounds, the third to *u*, the fourth to *o*, the fifth to sonant nasals and liquids, the sixth to the diphthongs *ai* (*āi*), *ei* (*ēi*), *oi* (*ōi*), *au*, *eu*, *ou*, the seventh to sound-changes in combination, as assimilation, contraction and elision, lengthening and shortening, anaptyxis, syncope and apocope. The results of the investigation are then summed up, with a determination of the value of each sound. Complete indices of the words of various dialects, and of the Latin words cited for comparison and illustration, greatly facilitate the use of the book. On p. 16 the *ll* of *mallom* is rightly regarded as without etymological significance, and Breal's derivation from **malvas* rejected; but attention should be called to the fact that such doubling of consonants is common in Oscan (see Planta, p. 537); another instance of *ll* is *Hellevis*. On p. 19 the form *Patanat* is made to disprove Brugmann's earlier hypothesis explaining the gerundive ending *-ndo* from *-ino*. This hypothesis Brugmann now discards (*Grundriss*, II, p. 1425) in favor of a derivation from infinitive + prep. *do* = *to*. The alleged dropping of *r* before *n* in *Falenia* receives weak support from *pestlum*. Compare *Fensernu*, *Freternum*, and other words where *r* before *n* is regularly retained. Buecheler's skepticism seems therefore warranted. On p. 29 we are glad to see Stolz's derivation of *quom*, *tum* from **quo-sme*, **to-sme* rejected as impossible. On p. 26, under the representatives of Indog. *ā*, *cāro*, *cārnīs* is given. The same mistake in quantity is made in the index. On p. 35 we have the inter-

esting suggestion that in the ending *-āsio*, *ās* may be originally a gen. case-ending to which was added the suffix *-ḡo*. That another form, *Flozasḡo*, from *Flozas* (*z* for *s* by sentence-Sandhi), should have coexisted seems highly improbable. On p. 37 *kahad* in the lead tablet defixio is considered, despite Buecheler, as a subjunctive, and this seems not unlikely. The history of the *a*-sound is comparatively simple, the *a* being preserved even in unaccented syllables, where in Latin it would suffer weakening. Final *ā*, however, does suffer a change, *viā* being represented by *viū*, *viu*. In the Latin alphabet both *u* and *o* are used, and in Greek *o*, so that Buck thinks the sound really intended was like the *a* in *call*. On p. 50 Oscan *pomtis*, 'quinquies,' and Umb. *nuvis*, *noviens*, are regarded as analogical formations, after **du-is* and **tri-s*, thus avoiding the difficulty of connecting the ending *is* with the Latin *-ies*, *-iens*. The same explanation is given by Bronisch, p. 132, for *pomtis*, and with less certainty for *nuvis*. The discussion of the reasons for the invention of a new sign, $\vdash = \dot{t}$, is most interesting. In Latin Indog. \dot{t} had a closer pronunciation than Indog. \dot{i} . This was probably true in Oscan, and so, for the sake of differentiation, the new character was devised to represent Indog. \dot{i} and the \dot{i} -sounds developed from Indogerm. ϵ . Hence the Indog. ϵ is regularly represented by \dot{i} or \dot{u} . One finds it hard to believe, however, that *ist* = *ēs*, inasmuch as we have *est* also in Oscan (Rhein. Mus. 44, 320), and the support adduced both by Buck and Bronisch from *ēs* of the comic poets falls away, if we adopt the explanation of Skutsch, *Forschungen*, p. 60, that *ēs*, not *ēs*, was spoken before vowels and *ēs* before consonants in the time of Plautus.

A long discussion is given of the representation of *u* after dentals by *iu*, as in *ūlliumam*, which, it is claimed, does not stand for *ū*, but no conclusion is reached as to the real nature of the affection. A fair parallel seems to be afforded by the precise pronunciation of *nature* (*natyur*) and *verdure* (*verdyyur*). Planta, on the other hand, p. 126, comes to the conclusion that it does represent *ū*. On p. 117 Buck proves Stolz to be in error in deriving *homo* from *hemo* by assimilation, it being rather a case of original ablaut. On p. 118 two ingenious explanations are offered for the *o* in *pomptis* over against the \dot{i} of *quinquies*. The latter, of which a parallel is found in *coquo* from **pekuō*, seems to us the more plausible. For the ending of the gen. pl. *ōm* is accepted, not *ōm*, with Osthoff, and it is proved that *ō* had a much closer sound than *ō*, and nearer *u*, by which it is regularly represented in the Tabula Bantina. We must assume also that in primitive Italic *ō* and *ō*, like ϵ and ϵ , differed in quality as well as in quantity, a fact which the writers of school-grammars would do well to bear in mind.

Chapters VI and VII, which space forbids our noticing, contain many points of interest to the Latinist. In fact, it is high time that the Latinist should awake to the fact that he has much to learn from Oscan and Umbrian, and that he cannot be absolved any more than a Greek scholar from the study of dialects. It is to be hoped that this book, written by an American, and a positive contribution to science, will be studied by Americans. There are quite a number of misprints, some of which are corrected at the end. Not among these are 'ludi Attelani' and 'mnoophthongischen,' on pp. 158 and 159.

MINTON WARREN.